



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,560	10/15/2004	Keith Robert Broerman	PU020131	4196
Joseph S Tripoli Thomson Licensing Inc Patent Department PO Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312				
7590 09/29/2008			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, THANH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2144	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/29/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10511560	10/15/04	BROERMAN ET AL.	PU020131

Joseph S Tripoli  
Thomson Licensing Inc  
Patent Department  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

**EXAMINER**

Thanh Tammy Nguyen

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2144 20080925

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

In response to AFTER ALLOWANCE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.31 filed on September 23, 2008. Examiner stated reason for allowance as shown in pages 8-9 of Notice of allowance filed on September 18, 2008. Specially with this Appeal brief filed on July 29, 2008, The examiner is no need to state the reason for allowance as stated: "This communication warrants no examiner's reason for allowance, as applicant's reply makes evident the reason for allowance, satisfying the record as whole as required by rule 37 CFR 1.104 (e). In this case, the substance of applicant's remarks filed on January 19, 2007 with respect to the amended claim limitations point out and make clear the reason claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Thus, the reason for allowance is in all probability evident from the record and no statement for examiner's reason for allowance is necessary (see MPEP 13202.14)."

/Thanh Tammy Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2144